



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS

OCTOBER, 1913.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND THE IDEAL OF NATIONALITY.

G. F. BARBOUR.

THERE are certain points in the history of civilization at which ideals, previously unquestioned, are tested and put upon their defence. At the present time the principle of nationality, which in most past ages has been accepted as above dispute, is undergoing such a testing process. Its claims are being set against those of the wider principle which may be described from slightly different points of view as humanitarian, cosmopolitan, or universalistic. Now the place of this wider principle or ideal as one of the highest ends of human progress is too clear to be overlooked or denied; and, since we cannot seek to displace it, the question arises whether the ideal of nationality must be rejected as outworn and as a mere hindrance to progress, or if both may continue to be held as supplementary and not inconsistent.

Is the principle of nationality abrogated by that of universal brotherhood, or may it be conserved as an essential part of the latter? The question is a living one; and not only is it answered in various ways, but it may be approached from several different points. Of these three may be named. It would be possible to attempt a general survey of recent thought, with the object of determining whether the cause of nationalism is a grow-

ing or a declining one. Or the inquiry might be confined to either of the two great forms in which the doctrine of universal brotherhood has been brought forward in our own time; for it has been founded both on the basis of economic socialism and on that of an essentially religious view of the solidarity of mankind. Each method of inquiry has its own advantages and its own importance; but in this essay the last will be the line chiefly followed. Historic and economic considerations will not be excluded, but the main question treated will be, How does the religious view of mankind as one in their deepest nature and their ultimate destiny affect the principle of nationality?

Further, I shall take Christian ethics as for the present purpose representative of the ethics of the higher religions; not only because it is wise to write of what one knows best, but because of the advantage of keeping the discussion within definite limits, and because the question is especially urgent at the present time for those nations of the West, which in form at least accept the Christian standard as authoritative. To limit the discussion in this way does, indeed, raise a considerable difficulty, but it is balanced by a corresponding advantage. The difficulty is due to the fact that Christianity arose at a time when the currents of national life had grown feeble,—when indeed they had been well-nigh merged in the single mighty stream of imperial history, or were fast sinking to rest in the level expanse of the *pax Romana*. Thus the writers of the New Testament were comparatively little concerned with the duties of patriotism and the problems of citizenship; and we are forced to gather their views in the main from scanty references and indirect allusions. But this fact in the origin of Christian ethics, while it reduces the amount of the direct data, has the advantage of bringing clearly before us the remarkable parallel between that age and our own.

The first and second centuries of our era marked the

close of a long period during which old landmarks and barriers had been successively removed, and nation after nation had been drawn from its isolation to share in the great commerce, of ideas as well as of merchandise, which united the shores of the Mediterranean and which extended even to the distant East. Thus there arose a great mingling of races, languages, customs, and religions,—a mingling which opened the possibility of a richer and more varied experience, but which at the same time tended to deprive the nations, which thus contributed to the common stock, of their most distinctive characteristics as well as of their hardier and simpler virtues. Nor is there any need to show at length how all this is repeated to-day in that mingling, not only of various races but of contrasted ideals and warring systems of life and thought, which is passing before our eyes. Here, then, the task of Christianity is the same once again as in its early days, that of mutual interpretation and reconciliation.

But this is not a complete statement of the case. Although many of the circumstances of nineteen centuries ago are being reproduced, and reproduced with an acceleration proportioned to the speed of steam and electricity when compared with the swiftest ships or posts of the Roman Empire, yet there are counter-tendencies which bear most directly on this problem. For nearly two centuries before the Christian era, the tendency towards the obliteration of national distinctions in a single unified civilization under one strong rule had advanced in an almost straight line. There was little to check this tendency in thought or literature or art, and any attempts at the revival of nationality in the political sphere were quickly and decisively put down.

But in modern history there has been no such direct and even course traceable. The eighteenth century, as an 'age of Reason,' tended towards cosmopolitanism; for when life is tried by purely rational standards its universal elements are inevitably exalted at the expense

of those differing traits of taste and temperament which distinguish race from race. But with the great romantic movement at the beginning of the nineteenth century, these differences once more gained recognition. The emotional side of man's nature,—sentiment, impulse, and all that is included in the word 'romance,'—were once more given free play, and found expression in the eager study of the past, and in particular of national history and art. Thus, in spite of the cosmopolitanism of Goethe, its greatest figure, the romantic movement did much to reawaken the spirit of nationality and to prepare the way for the political and militant nationalism of the mid-nineteenth century. So the thought arises that in the twentieth century, whose tendencies are still so hard to interpret aright, the greatest problem will be the reaching of a synthesis of these two elements, in which the patriotism of the romantic movement with all its warmth of appeal to the imagination and the devotion of the good citizen, may find its due place beside the enlightened yet somewhat chill and abstract cosmopolitanism of the eighteenth century.

This may seem something of a digression; but it at least suggests that the parallel between the present state of the world and that of Roman times is not altogether complete. There is an element of contrast due to the presence of several great empires in place of one, and to the persistence beside them of smaller nations which retain a clear self-consciousness and a vigorous and distinctive national life. All this adds to the complexity as well as to the interest of our problem; yet it does not annul the instructiveness of the comparison between these moments in ancient and modern history. Our age is at all events near enough to that in which Christianity arose to enable us more readily to appreciate the effect of, as well as the preparation for, its clear proclamation of universalism.

That proclamation has always been its central message. It had its origin, indeed, amid the nationalism

and the measure of exclusiveness which marked Jewish religion; but it quickly passed into a freer air, proclaiming the equal value of all men before God as an essential truth. It emphasized the obligation laid upon all and the high destiny open to all, whatever their race or social standing. Thus it soon became the most powerful of the many forces which were undermining old distinctions and working towards the upbuilding of a moral society on a basis broader than any hitherto known. Nor did it only point forward, like Jewish prophecy, to a cessation of old feuds and to a harmony of nation and nation in the future. The unity which it proclaimed was at once more fundamental and more immediate, a unity of spiritual life, in which there was "neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female" (Gal. iii. 28). Or, in so far as the idea of nationality persisted, membership in even the most privileged of all nations appeared but as a type of a spiritual state,— "he is a Jew which is one inwardly" (Rom. ii. 29).

It is the most familiar of truths that this sense of human brotherhood, thus brought down from the remote atmosphere of philosophic theory or poetic aspiration and realized on the common soil of every day life, gave no small part of its triumphant energy to the early Church. To a world weary of never-ending conflict, and already reaching out towards a closer union and a deeper comprehension between all followers of truth and goodness, this message, and the fact that it was in a measure realized, brought a new light and hope. Not that the need for strife and conflict had passed: the call to brotherhood was also a call to arms, yet it did not summon to a conflict between one race and another, but to one in which all good men might join against "the corruption that is in the world."

This sense of solidarity, which drew men closely together amid the welter of nationalities of that time, and which gave the Church strength to face and finally to bend the whole power of Rome, had to make its way

in the face of many obstacles. And the same obstacles exist in great measure to-day. If in many cases the western nations have attained to a larger measure of understanding and respect, there are others in which a jealous and watchful rivalry is still the prevailing temper. But more serious than any alienation of nation from nation within the wider branches of the human family, are the questions which rise out of the misunderstanding and mutual contempt which arise from the contact of these different branches. Here we are confronted by those inter-racial problems, social, industrial, and political, which make 'the color-question' so insistent and so menacing wherever it arises. It assumes many forms, by which statesmanship is already taxed and must ultimately be baffled unless a spirit of brotherhood comparable to that of early Christianity can be reawakened. In this all-important region the difficulty is practical rather than theoretic. *How* the different interests of different races, in varying stages of civilization, are in fact to be adjusted, we are often unable to see; yet, at the same time, we may say confidently that such an adjustment must prove impossible on any other ground than that of mutual understanding, mutual respect, mutual forbearance, and mutual service. These may be taken as four steps in the progress towards the ideal held up in the New Testament; and they apply not less to the relations of race with race than to the thought and action of individuals. They form the preliminary to all the work of inter-racial statesmanship,—the indispensable equipment both of the statesman and of those who form the material of his craft.

But the question remains how much this involves. Does the ideal of human brotherhood, so clear in its ultimate demand, yet so hard to work out in the life of the world, necessarily abrogate and abolish the ideals of loyalty and patriotism? Tolstoi and others have held that it does, and that the humanitarianism of Christianity is so direct in its method as well as so wide in its

scope that no room is left for the intervention of a narrower loyalty; and those who urge this view can always point to the hatred that has been stirred up and the havoc that has been wrought in the name of the love of country. Thus, it can be made to appear that the 'principle of nationality' is just a euphemism for that spirit of exclusiveness and vindictiveness which the highest morality and religion seek to exorcise. On this view the perpetuation of old divisions between one nation and another runs directly counter to the Christian spirit and forms in itself a final obstacle to its realization.

Yet there is a strong and deep human instinct which rebels against this conclusion. If patriotism has often been associated with intolerance, if love of one's own country has often been identified with hatred of other countries, this is no true account of the spirit of nationality in its nobler forms; nor can we without reluctance dismiss a conception which has so often awakened, guided, and sustained the noblest aspirations and energies of man. If there are in the New Testament indications that the spirit of nationality is not to be regarded as an unfriendly force, and if it is possible to distinguish between a higher and a lower patriotism, then these mighty factors in human history may be conserved without danger, and may even be made ancillary to the wider Christian principle of human solidarity and brotherhood.

In the life and teaching of Jesus, a recognition of the good that there is in nationality can be looked for in one point only, his attitude to his own people. There are not a few things to show how deep a reverence he felt for their traditions and history, and how deep a concern for their future destiny. His own ministry was almost entirely confined within the borders of the Jewish nation, and in all outward observance, which did not directly conflict with his own mission, he bore himself as a pious Jew. Indeed so clearly does this appear in

the Synoptic narrative that some interpreters have even held that Jesus never definitely crossed the borders of Jewish particularism, but that the universalism of the early Church was originated by St. Paul; and, while this may be a paradoxical view, it would never have taken shape unless there had been in the life of Jesus a quite distinctive devotion to the past history and the spiritual interests of the Jewish nation.

Thus, while the teaching of Jesus was in essence universal, it had a special urgency for and adaptation to the sacred people to whom 'as concerning the flesh' he belonged. On the one hand, he enjoined such universal duties as that of the forgiveness of enemies, and taught that the mere fact of membership in the Jewish nation was no substitute for the faith which could grow strong outside its borders, and that in the absence of this faith the privilege of the Jews became a hindrance rather than an advantage; while in proclaiming that mercy and helpfulness were the tests by which men would finally be judged, he applied this test to 'all nations,' and not to the Jews alone (Matt. v. 39 ff.; viii. 10-12; xxv, 32. Cf. Luke x. 29 ff.). But if these and like sayings represent the deepest current of his teaching, the other side was not unrecognized. With the Jewish longing for political emancipation, Jesus had little concern; or rather he definitely cut himself off from it as from an influence dangerous to his own more spiritual work. Yet, as we have in part seen, he was far from being indifferent to the special claims and hopes of the Jews. He encouraged his disciples by recalling the national history; he recognized that the Jewish people had the first claim on his own ministry and on that of his followers; and in the lament over Jerusalem as in his triumphal entry into the city he showed how closely the idea of his own mission had been bound up with that of the redemption of his nation. (Matt. v. 12; x. 5, 6; xv, 24; xxi. 1-11; xxiii. 37.) More might be said on this point; but it is sufficient to suggest that the universalism of the Gospels is

not necessarily exclusive of the truth that different peoples may each have its special aptitude, fitting it to work out some one of the many varying aspects of the Christian ideal.

This suggestion is confirmed by the study of the Pauline Epistles. While St. Paul did not originate, he certainly established and placed beyond challenge the inherent universality of the new religion. To this aspect of his work was due the charge of disloyalty to his nation which he was often compelled to answer. But even if he had never been assailed by the Judaizing party, we may believe that he would still have felt impelled to show that the fullest recognition of the unique historical place and work of the Jewish people was in no degree inconsistent with the truth, which he so steadily proclaimed, that all national distinctions faded into insignificance when compared with the new unity which was irradiating the world's life. (*Cf.* Rom. ii.-iii. 2; ix.-xi.) His faith had burst the bonds of Jewish legalism, but he did not therefore hold the fate of the Jewish nation or his own duty towards it as of little account; for he earnestly asserted his readiness to give up his own share in the Christian fellowship and hope, if only his "kinsmen according to the flesh" might thereby enter in (Rom. ix. 3.).

With the writings of St. Paul there enters also a conception to which the early Fathers not seldom returned, —that the Jews were not the only people who had a definite and essential place in the *præparatio evangelica*. An appreciation of what the clear intellect of Greece and the strong purpose and firm hand of Rome might do to enrich and strengthen the thought and will of the Church began to find its place. At first indeed the recognition was carefully guarded; yet even in the Epistle in which St. Paul most strongly condemns the natural 'wisdom' of the Greeks as inadequate to the spiritual need of the world, he tells how he had sought to place himself at the standpoint of those who were outside the

scope of the Jewish Law that he might win their understanding and allegiance (I Cor. i. 21-23; ix. 21). The reality of his appreciation of the nobler side of Greek thought shines out clearly in the report of his speech on the Areopagus; and in the narrative of the Book of Acts, as in the counsel of respect and submission to rulers in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, there are clear indications of the value which he set upon his Roman citizenship, and of his sense of the service to humanity and religion performed by the firm rule of Rome. It is true that for St. Paul, as for Plato, all earthly citizenship was but an imperfect type of citizenship in the Heavenly City. Yet in their own place in the divine economy these things were not without importance: they were good gifts which might be turned to good account, even if they were not essential to the spiritual life. Thus we may hold that he would have applied to political liberty with all its dignity and responsibilities, what he said of civil liberty, "If thou canst become free, use it rather" (I Cor. vii. 21).

We may now turn to view the question from the other side, by considering certain of the tendencies which are actually at the present time making for the break-down of national exclusiveness and for a more cosmopolitan ordering of human life. Among these tendencies, we may pass over those which are directly inspired by an ethical ideal. But there are other tendencies belonging to the economic order, of which the full strength is only now beginning to be understood, and which are thus more difficult to evaluate rightly.

(1) The attempt to understand these forces at once carries us into a very different atmosphere,—that of modern industry and finance in all their complexity and ramification. In spite of all efforts after commercial isolation, these great forms of human activity refuse to be confined within national boundaries and show an increasing international character. The fact of this internationalization of modern industry and finance, with the

consequent dependence of each nation's prosperity on the credit and prosperity of its neighbors, has been made familiar by the writings of Mr. Norman Angell. He has shown how any nation which tries by force of arms to destroy the trade of a neighboring people must inevitably bring loss, if not industrial ruin, upon itself in the attempt; and he looks to the realization that aggression must react disastrously on the aggressor as the great safeguard of peace in the future. He holds that when the financial interdependence of the modern world, hitherto understood only by a few experts, comes to be a generally known and accepted fact, then the present appalling competition in armaments will be checked, and the warlike spirit in Europe will die away. When it is once seen that the present military rivalry is not only contrary to moral ideals, but futile from the standpoint of material interests, it will die a natural death; and the precarious 'armed peace' of to-day will pass into an industrial comity of nations, safeguarded by the knowledge that the threads of their prosperity are inextricably interwoven.

This analysis is full of interest, and holds out not a little hope for the future. It is something to know that high finance, which has in the past had so much to answer for in the fostering of political greed and the desire for aggrandizement, not to mention other faults, is now at last beginning to appear as a check upon militarism and an advocate for peace. Its accession may, indeed, bring a new driving-power and a practical character into the movement for the lessening of hostility between the nations; and it is certainly, as Mr. Angell claims, calculated to impress the average man. Yet, the question must arise how far we shall really be carried towards a true and permanent sense of human brotherhood by the doctrine of the omnipotence of the credit nexus (which replaces the 'cash nexus,' on which Carlyle and other great teachers of the nineteenth century poured such scorn). It may indeed help to make the first step,—

the immediately urgent step,—possible; but if old evils are not to recur in new forms, some higher ideal of human relationship, some firmer ground of international unity, must be discovered.

This is in fact recognized by Mr. Angell when, in the second part of "The Great Illusion," he takes up the "psychological case for peace." In this connection, he lays great stress on the effect of the modern growth of rapid transit and communication in breaking down national divisions and causing a kinship of interest to grow up between the same classes in different countries. It appears that this is rapidly substituting a horizontal division between class and class for the old vertical divisions between country and country. In the last decade international organizations have grown and multiplied. In particular, the Trade Union and Socialist movement has become international; and employers of labor are now seeking to counteract this new development by themselves joining hands across the frontiers of Europe. This tendency is summed up in sentences which Mr. Angell quotes from Mr. Baty's work on "International Law": "The modern citizen is becoming at once cosmopolitan and class-centred. Let the process work for a few more years; we shall see the common interests of cosmopolitan classes revealing themselves as far more potent factors than the shadowy common interests of the subjects of States. . . . We are therefore confronted with a condition of affairs in which the force of nationality will be distinctly inferior to the force of class-cohesion, and in which classes will be internationally organized so as to wield their force with effect. The prospect induces some curious reflections."¹ Most certainly it does; and one of the most urgent is the question whether *this* cosmopolitanism will not have dangers as great as those of the nationalism which we know.

For there will be something tragic in the progress of

¹ See "The Great Illusion," pp. 140-1, 245-53.

our modern life if it carries us away from one long-standing form of misunderstanding and rivalry only to plunge us more deeply into another. The greatest virtue of the spirit of nationality has been just this,—that whenever it has been both strong and pure it has welded together classes and ranks, whose interests must always have been in some degree divergent, into a unity with common aims and a common power of self-devotion. Thus the love of country has provided a ground on which men might meet in forgetfulness of class-interests no less than of private gain, only remembering and working for the good of the whole realm. In this ideal, which has been something more than a mere dream in all the great periods of history, there may well be seen a nearer approach to the Christian standard than in the conception of a world-wide union for the protection or promotion of class-interests. A true nobility may indeed be shown in the latter form of contest by those who identify themselves with the cause of the disinherited and oppressed. But the more such a movement cuts itself adrift from national loyalties and becomes purely economic, the more difficult does it become to imagine it as inspiring the warm and chivalrous self-devotion which we associate with true patriotism. At the best, one form of exclusiveness is banished, but another and hardly less dangerous form enters in its place.

Further, if the approach of a class-war is one of the greatest dangers of the present day, and if, as we know to be the case, the whole resources of modern governments are strained in the attempt to arbitrate and reconcile, what hope of such an arbitrament will there be if the contest is transferred from the national to the world-wide arena? If the moral authority with which the government of a man's own fatherland speaks to him is not strong enough to awaken a spirit of conciliation and respect for the claims of others, is it likely that any international authority that we can imagine will succeed? If the unifying force of patriotism fails to recon-

cile class and class, there may well be no issue save the cruel one of untempered economic war.

(2) Two other disquieting tendencies of modern cosmopolitanism also claim our attention. The first is the tendency of civilization to extinguish all differences, and reduce life everywhere more and more to a common type. We may admit that the aim of those who most consciously and earnestly seek to direct its course is to raise the general level of human nature; but unhappily the result of modern 'progress,' so largely impersonal in its mode of working, includes a vast amount of 'leveling down' as well. Standardization is everywhere the rule, and the color and variety of life fade away before its advance. It is indeed true that uniformity, in dress, customs, language, and mental outlook, has great practical conveniences and advantages; and it may even be suggested that it is only the artist and the student of life, who have leisure to delight in contrast and variety, who suffer through their disappearance. These considerations might indeed satisfy us if each nation only surrendered its own characteristics in order to assume the best that other nations had to afford; but our modern uniformity is determined too often by cheapness rather than by excellence. It is the commodity which is most economically produced on the greatest scale, or the habit which is most easily acquired, that becomes dominant and almost universal; and so the varied color of the world passes into a monotony which is not less monotonous because it is 'up-to-date.'

Nor can it be said that this is a merely imaginary danger. At the Universal Races Congress held in London in 1911, one speaker after another emphasized the fact that inter-racial harmony is far from involving uniformity; indeed the latter was pointed out rather as a risk to be avoided than as an end to be pursued.² It is true

² As an example, I may quote the words of a distinguished English authority on ethnology, Professor Haddon: "I believe largely in the comparative permanence of what are called racial characteristics; I sincerely

that the contact of different races has been in the highest degree fruitful in the past, and may be so again; but it can only be so if the races are indeed *different*, and if they are able, even amid the freest interchange and commerce of ideas, to maintain their distinct individualities and to bring their varying contributions. The new tendency to uniformity might prove just as fatal to this fruitful exchange of ideas and experiences as was the old isolation. Assuredly, such exchange cannot take place between those whose nature has been bleached to a single pallid monotony.

(3) But there is a yet graver danger in the fortuitous cosmopolitanism of modern life. If it merely diminished the color of the world, this would indeed be an impoverishment to the race, but it might leave the individual very nearly where he stood before; for the most intense experiences of his life will come to him equally whether he lives in a vast and uniform society, or in one that is highly differentiated, where individual character obtains free play. But in the mingling at haphazard of many races, there is involved for each the breaking down of old restraints, and hence the possibility of grave moral peril. The great meeting-places where the currents of Oriental and Occidental life have come together have indeed produced a vivid and brilliant type of life, but hardly one that has been morally stable and sound. Nor is this hard to understand. In the first contact and clash of diverse races, the members of each see around them many unfamiliar and enticing customs. Their own traditional restraints fall away, and they fail to appreciate or adopt those of the nation with whom they have but now come into touch. This process can be traced

hope they will not be merged into a common world. . . . Nearly every group of peoples has developed its own mentality, its own psychology, ideas and ideals. We need to preserve the difference between those ideas and ideals. If you merge them, you get a common,—a very common,—humanity. All progress takes place in the reaction between extremes. All philosophy has arisen from a mixture of races which brought to one another different ideas and ideals.” (“Record of Proceedings,” p. 26.)

in all the great meetings of East and West, of civilized and savage man; and, in a minor degree, it may be seen in the contact of nations more nearly akin. For it is always easier to understand unfamiliar vices than unfamiliar virtues. It may well be the case that no nation in reality "wears its heart upon its sleeve." There are always reserves that are not readily laid aside, depths which only time and sympathy can sound; and it is in these that the finer soul of nationality must in most cases be sought. Any fool can appreciate and imitate his neighbour's vices, but only the wise man has patience to study, to understand, and to follow virtues which at first, and perhaps for long, are strange to him.

This, then, is the most serious danger involved in the mingling of nationalities which is so marked a feature of our day. It is easier to break down than to build up, and harmful influences tend to travel more swiftly than those that are helpful. As we saw at the outset, this was the situation which early Christianity had to meet, and in face of which its victories were won. But to-day the breaking down of old barriers and restraints is not yet so complete as it was then. In many lands the spur of national and patriotic feeling is still strong; and, when this has proved so mighty an instrument of moral discipline in the past, teaching restraint and calling for unselfish effort in the common cause, may it not still be used in the same great interest at once to support and to concentrate the wider humanitarian impulse which, without such direction, is apt to dissipate its energy in too wide a field? There may indeed be a few great men whose enthusiasm can compass the width of the world without any such dissipation, and without (in Aristotle's phrase) becoming 'watery' through too great diffusion. Yet even for them there must be some added zest in work done for their own people; and the average man will find his moral enthusiasm not lowered but raised by the touch of patriotism, whether he be working di-

rectly for the good of his own country or seeking to represent and apply her ideals in service beyond her borders. In this way, a patriotism purified of its narrower and less worthy elements may be recognized as an ally rather than a foe to the Christian 'enthusiasm of humanity.'

We have indeed seen that there are dangers attendant on the ideas of patriotism and nationality. They may come to be identified with an attitude of exclusiveness and intolerance, just as they may be appealed to in justification of a spirit of aggression and reckless national aggrandizement. But we have seen a danger on the side of cosmopolitanism as well,—the danger that, in the break-down of nationality, its assured good may be destroyed as well as its not infrequent evil, and that this good (the spirit of self-effacement and discipline, and the rich variety of national life) may prove hard or impossible to replace. But if the ideal of mere cosmopolitanism is thus an imperfect one, may it not be possible to find another in which both dangers are avoided, and which will thus prove a more adequate instrument for the application of the principles of Christian ethics to the life of the world?

This end may perhaps be attained if we adopt a conception, not so much cosmopolitan as *international*. The distinction may seem over-subtle, but there is a real difference between the former ideal, which seeks to gain the universal end through the negation of nationality, and the latter, which strives to include what is best in nationality in a wider synthesis.

This distinction is suggested by the concluding words of a paper, submitted to the Universal Races Congress by Dr. Lange, the General Secretary of the Interparliamentary Union: "I do not see any ideal in international uniformity. On the contrary, national and racial diversity is in my opinion a condition of progress and life. The very word *international* has the word *national* as one of its component parts, as an essential condition

of its meaning.”³ The problem thus comes to be, can this international ideal be worked out in practice, and can it be made a ruling principle of action? Can the love of country, rightly directed, be made to subserve instead of opposing the wider love of mankind? Was Mazzini right when he taught that nationality was the lever by which humanity should be raised, and that each nation should bring its own contribution to the advancement of the world in the rivalry not of violence but of service?⁴ If so, this ideal has an abiding place in the working out of the Christian hope for the world.

It is true that a great change of emphasis is needed. The idea that the true patriot is the man who most vigorously misunderstands and misrepresents other nations must be banished once for all. Instead of the animus of the natural man, with its fine objectivity and its unwillingness to pause and think, there must enter a more reflective spirit. The first duty to be enforced is that of understanding one's own country, in her deeper character, history, and traditions; and when this has been in some measure performed, a doubt may have emerged whether the duty of misunderstanding one's neighbour is really as fundamental as one had at first supposed. Not that the patriotic impulse will thus be weakened: it will rather be purified by a deeper appreciation of national needs as well as of national glory. For self-criticism is an essential factor in true patriotism, and when this leaven has once begun to work, it will join with a just enthusiasm for the things that are admirable in one's country's life, to assist in the appreciation of the characteristics and ideals of other peoples.

This idea that the path to the appreciation of alien ideals lies through an intelligent loyalty to those at home

³ “Interracial Problems,” p. 123.

⁴ Such a friendly rivalry is already arising not only in the spheres of science and of scholarship, but in the all-important sphere of social service; nor does any nation hesitate to give others the benefit of its experience and achievements in this form of endeavor.

has at first the appearance of a paradox. Yet it merely involves the application to nations of an undeniable fact of individual morality,—a fact which at once becomes clear if we compare the summation of the moral teaching of the Old Testament in the words, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour *as thyself*,” with the Golden Rule, which makes the treatment which we desire from others the standard of our conduct toward them. The truth which these sayings attest is that each man’s self-knowledge is the only starting-point from which he can set out to know, and hence to respect, the feelings and rights of others. Only on the basis of his own inner life can he understand that of his fellows; the supreme duty of sympathy presupposes that he who would exercise it must himself have felt. And the present contention is that there is here a true analogy, even though it is often unrecognized, between the moral relations of man with man and those of race with race.

We may test this theory, that loyalty to one’s own country is the only avenue to respect for the loyalties of others, by referring as briefly as may be to certain of the chief expressions of patriotism. Of these the spirit of warlike courage is the first in time, and it is also the least in favor of our analogy. For here, if anywhere, the clash of aims is of the essence of the matter, and the one end of patriotic action is to thwart the designs and ambitions of the opposing patriotism. Yet even here it cannot escape notice that, in all the nobler ages and forms of the military spirit, it has been regarded as necessarily including a ready recognition of the valor of opponents. Hence, while the objects of the combatants are directly opposed, each may hail with admiration the spirit of the other; and this mutual respect is grounded in the fact that each recognizes in his opponent a loyalty like that which he strives himself to display. Such a feeling has emerged in many different ages, but one of its most familiar expressions is to be found in the story of the Third Crusade; for the char-

acters of Saladin and Richard came to typify the fact that true nobility implies not only personal courage but a generous recognition of its presence in the enemy. Thus there is here at least an approach to the universal application of the standards of patriotic endeavor.

The case becomes clearer when we consider more peaceful but not less essential forms of the love of country. Of these forms the most direct is the love of the land itself in all its features. In its highest degree this love is hardly possible to even the most appreciative of passing strangers, for it depends on the steady devotion of one who knows his country, not in the garb of one season alone, but in the whole range of moods which come with the varied circle of the year. But while this is the prerogative of those alone who dwell in the land, they are not thereby disqualified from the appreciation of other countries. Rather the love of their own prepares them to enter in a measure into the similar love felt by other peoples.

So it is also in regard to national achievement in literature or art, or in any of the other great departments of human activity. Every man has a unique opportunity of understanding the attainment of his fellow-countrymen in its inner spirit and meaning; yet his appreciation of what they have done may and ought to prove not a hindrance but a help towards understanding the parallel yet diverse achievements of others. It has indeed been said that the conflict of ideals of culture is one main cause of the rivalry of nations; but if there be some truth in this, it can be but a limited truth. For it is not the diligent student of his own country's culture who is most ready to decry that of other countries: it is rather the Philistine, whose mind has been disciplined neither by the study of his own inheritance nor by the effort to appreciate that of others.

Once more, that high form of patriotism which is rooted in love for the great names of the past may best be learned at home. There is a continuity of national

tradition, which enables the work of those who have moulded this tradition to be understood and revered by those of their successors who worthily enter into it, as it can hardly be by strangers. At least there is an added intimacy which belongs to a compatriot alone. Few men have spoken to Europe as Luther spoke; yet his most learned and most ardent student outside the German race must feel that there is something which *he* can never attain in the tone in which an unlearned fellow-countryman speaks of "*unser* Doktor Martin Luther." But while this is so, it is not less true that there is nothing exclusive in reverence for the great dead, but that he who seeks first to understand the great names of his own nation will in so doing fit himself to appreciate the master-spirits of other countries as well. Each nation has a unique capacity, as well as duty, of honoring its own great men; but, in proportion as its members show themselves able to do so rightly, they will also become able to enter into the great common heritage of mankind.

This gift of loyalty to national ideals which is the deepest spring of racial endurance is more elusive and impalpable than we often realize, and it may be strongest where it is least tangible. Of its power the persistence of the Jewish race gives the most remarkable proof. Cut off from all the outward supports of patriotism, their last great military leader slain two thousand years ago, their country to the vast majority only a far-off memory and a dream, dispersed among many peoples and forced to use many different tongues,—they are yet united by the indestructible bond of a common tradition and a common belief in the divine vocation of their race; and thus they have been able to resist the shattering impact of centuries of dispersion and persecution and to wield at the end of it all a mighty influence on the thought and action of the world. Nor could they have accomplished what they have for mankind as a whole, had their racial tenacity and coherence not been proof against this repeated persecution and dispersion.

Only by maintaining their individuality have they been able to contribute an element of unique value to human progress. And, if our argument has not led us wholly astray, this represents the ideal not for one people alone, but for all. So far from contradicting the Christian principle, it is in full accord with it, that the different nations should lay aside, not their identity, but only their exclusiveness and intolerance, and by proving faithful to their several destinies should forward the wider destiny of the world.

This thought received one of its noblest as well as earliest expressions in the vision which came to a Jewish prophet twenty-six centuries ago, of the place which his people should take in history. The words of his vision will fitly conclude this paper, for they express in the terms of that distant age, the ideal which I have tried to indicate, of a state of society in which the nations shall form a unity, not reached through material subjection to an external empire, nor through the abdication by any of its own destiny, but through the desire to bring each its own powers and gifts freely and willingly to the spiritual intercourse of a harmonious world:

“In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt, to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria; and the Egyptians shall worship with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth; for that the Lord of hosts hath blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance” (Isaiah xix. 23-25).

G. F. BARBOUR.

EDINBURGH.